G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

File No. 327-13

1913.

Serial Nos. 1-6

(Inwards)

Later references

1-2-7

1-7-1

1922-27-1-10

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—6.

Part B for Aug. 17.

SUBJECT.

Inadvisability Realisations of Sri Hammanthraya Swamy temple at Kengal, Channapatna Taluk.

To, Dy. Commr. Bangalore No. 232. D. 1. 8. 17.

Forwards him a Copy of the G.O.

~~Ds~~ Dismissing the appeal petn. of Directg that the 'bond' will be put to public auction for a period of 5 years after the expiry of the present lease

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7 16

D. R. Appadurai.
Sher. (Ill D 112-9-17).

G.R.S. 11 1913.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mugrai)

NOTES.

File No. 3624

FILE HEADING.

Mudikanike realizations of Sri Hanumantharaya Swamy temple at Kengal in the channapatna Taluk.

From

Vodaluiga of Rampura, channapatna Taluk.

No. Petition Dated 13-8-1913 Received

Diary No. 4093 | Enclos. — | Spare Copies. — | Serial No 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

States that he is entitled to Mudikanike of the above temple, and prays for the cancellation of the order directing the auction sale of Mudikanike

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Submitted with a Dft. calling for report with records.

MW(US) 12-1-1914 Avm 13/1/14

Issue

Ins

CM

NOTES—First Sheet.

GIB--35,000--15-12

and Revenue
retariat.

File No. 322 of 1913.

Serial No.	
2	To The Dy. Comm^r. Bangalore Dt. No. 1895 dy 27.1.14 Forwards above for report records. No. 1896 dy 27.1.14 Intimates the above to the petitioners.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7-11-13

Routine Notes. Kurunegala 322-13-3

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

D.R.O. : 311

Petition received from the Office of the Deputy :-

Vadaluga of Reeraperu village in the Chilaw Pelata D.K. praying that early orders may issue in the matter of the cancellation of the order of the D.K. authorising the sale by public auction of the "Mudikanike etc" of the temple of Sree Isha Munaeshwaraya Swami at Kengal, as he is entitled to get the same in the absence of any other source of income.

This is a reminder appln. This previous petn. D.R.O. 403 of 13-14 in the matter has been forwarded

N B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

GPB—50,000—29 6 14

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

To the Dy Com^r, Bangalore for report in this Office No: 1895 dt 27.1.14.

Mem 329-13-2

Draft forwarding the petn in court to expedite the report called for already sent - with a draft endorst to the petr^r.

19.8.15

The petn mens that the order absolute against mr S.D.O and it should have been sent to Dy Com^r for disposal. The previous petn was finally dealt with as an appeal against the Dy Com^r's order. However the present petn being only a reminder may be sent in cmtt. Draft

Bs 7815

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

GPB—50,000—29 6 14

G.R.S. 13]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

(4)

Accn 7 322-13-4,
No: 669 dt 2-9-15
To Dy Com Bangalore
Ltr No a/cs Supplies
in conn with the Mysore

Sch

N B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

GPB—50,000—20-6-14

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 322 of 1913.

Serial No. 5

From, the Dy Commr, Bangalore Dist, Letter no. 732 Dy 13-5-1916.

Submits report with records, on the petition of Vadaliga, Bhajantri and Harijan of Sri Kengal Hanumantharaya Swami Temple in the Chennapatna Taluk appealing against the Dy. Commrs order ~~directing~~ confirming the auction sale of the right of collecting Mudikanike in the said Temple.

The Dy. Commrs report explains the facts of the case fully.

If directed, the case will be posted for hearing.

Submitted for orders.

M W (illegible)
3-11-1916

The order appealed against is that of the Subordinate Officer, Returning the records to the Dy Commr for his disposal and intimation by endorsement to the appellant

Dy
3.11.16

I see that the appeal is against the Dy Commr

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Case No 9 6 17

G. R. S. 121

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 328 of 1912

Serial No.

Put the case for hearing with the next batch of cases

he
9.12.16

Submitted with 172 notices to the Govt Pleader
97

NCSW
5.2.17

Advocate
he
6.2.17

The subject matter of concern the right to collect Mudi and Uttara Kanike at Kengal Hanumantaraya temple. A hereditary right was alleged by the appellants' elder brother Venga but it was not accepted and the right was put up to auction. Venga subsequently agreed to pay the sum realised thereupon but did not make good the undertaking. As a consequence the right was again sold. It is to this sale that the appellant objects.

The hereditary right has not been established. From the nature of the Kanike the existence of such a right is highly improbable. As Bajantry and as ex-Mirasi barber he is perhaps entitled to a separate payment or a share in the Kanike but he cannot lay claim to the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

D 1233—GPB—60,000—1-12-16—S.

II-21

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 322 of 1913

Serial No.

after Kanika. This seems to be admitted in a way as it is stated that Rs 15 was being paid to temple after Bajaury on account of Kanika created by him.

The lease expires in ~~Sept~~ Dec next and it may be allowed to run the claim advanced after appellant may once again be considered at the time. With this recommendation the Appeal may be dismissed

(Ms member) Lee 28-2-17

Mr Lakshminarayan Jena for appellant and Mr N.V. Narasimham for Respts. ~~—~~ Both of them not ready, case is adjd. Date will be intimated later on

Lee 2-3-17

Mr L.N Jena for appellant and Mr Srinivasa for Respts appeared and argued the case. Order reserved

(Ms member) Lee 10-4-17

Oth. reliefs & 10% Appl. Subs.

1896

ND 12b)—G1 B—60 000—1 12-16—S.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 372- of 191 7

Serial No

283/21.7

Order

The appellant claims the right to collect kundi-[illegible] & wheat Kanwa as a hereditary 'hak'. But he has adduced no evidence before the Lower Court to establish his hereditary right. There are many makers of these Kanwas, it is highly improbable that such a right was ever claimed & exercised. [illegible] The head-q[uarter]s of the Magistrate & the Temple does not necessarily entitle him to collect these Kanwas for the Temple & pay what he likes to the Institution. He may be found "wandering" taking like the shown servants of the Temple for the duties he performs in the Temple. [illegible] Their practice proves the above Temples & to have not such 'Kanwas' for a long period and the Temple as been wholly absent in the matter also. On the subject of the personal-head which is referred to me in the end of the order, the 'Gor' is the part of the public concerned for a period of [illegible] years

The appeal is dismissed

Lower

17/7/17. dea 24/7 23/7/17

Returned with a Separate order.

NOTE—Contn sheet

82/27.7.17 26.7.17 Secy) Asst dea 28/7/17 28/7/17

1.496

WD 1233—GPB—60,000—1-12-16—S.

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 322 of 1913

Serial No.	
6	No: 232 of 1.8.17, 2 Dep of Baroda, has been a copy of the order dismissing the appeal petn, & directs that the said case be published for public execution in place of 3 years after 2 years of the present date.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

403

B 14
mu
322-

12)

ಮೈಸೂರ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯದ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

19 16 —19 17 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೂಲ-ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರು. 9

ವಾದಿ.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

ಮೈ ರಾ ಬಿ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀನಾರಾಯಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಬಿನ್ ಬಿಳಿಗಿರಿಯಪ್ಪ

ಎ ಶಿವರಾಮಯ್ಯ ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ತಿನಾಮ.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ನಂಬರ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮ್ಮಿಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್‌ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ, ಆರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕ್ರೀ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕ್ಕೊಂಡು ರಸೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗಾಗಿ ವಾಪಸು ಆಗುವ ದಾವಾ ಸಾಮಾನು ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸಸಾಮಾನು ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಬಾಬತ್ತು ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ದಸ್ತೈಲು ವಜಾ ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಸಹ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮಿಗ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನಡಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇಧ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 2-3-17. ರುಜು. ಬಿ-ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀನಾರಾಯಣಯ್ಯ

ಈ ನೊಕ್ತಾರ್‌ನಾಮ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯುಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿ ಇಧ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈ ನೊಕ್ತಾರ್‌ನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇಸ್ದೇನೆ.

B-Lakshminarayana

ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪ್ ವೆಂಡರ್ ರಾಯ. ನಂಜುಂಡಪ್ಪನವ್ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿತ್ತು.

ಒರೂ ONE RUPEE ಒರೂ ONE RUPEE ಷರತ್ತು-1

ಸರ್ 1915-16ನೇ ನಂಬರು 9

ವಾದಿ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

Vs.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾ॥ ರಾ॥ ಎಸ್. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್, ಬಿ. ಎ, ಬಿ. ಎಲ್., ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್
& C. Suiga Rao, B.A. LL.B, Advocate
ಯವರಿಗೆ.

ಒರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಪ್ಪೈರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏವಾದ ಜರಿಗಿನಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿ ಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೂಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹಾ ವಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗಾಗಿ ರೀಫಂಡ್ ಆಗಬಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪನ್ನು ವಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ವಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮಗೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಧೇನೆ.

ಈ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾನ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇಧ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 21/3/17 } ರುಜು.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜುಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇಧ್ದೇನೆ.

21/3/17

The Irish Press, Bangalore City

2855 No 1895 Ex. 1. 837.1 1914

Mun. 322-13-2

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

1911

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No .....

The accompanying Petition Registered
No. 1083 dated. 13-8-1913
received at the General and Revenue
Secretariat from Voda Linga, Bhajantri
and Bajan Baravardalar of
Sri Hanumanthaiaya Swamy
temple at Kengal in the
Channapatna Taluk stating
that he is entitled to get
"Mudikanike" realizations of the temple by
virtue of his office, and praying
for the cancellation of the
order directing the auction sale of a
"Mudi Kanike"

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~
to the Dy. Commr.
Bangalore Dist.
..... for report
with record

By order,
Lee 1911
Secretary to Govt.

13/11

BANGALORE
..... 191 .

P. T. O.

GTB -1,000 8-8 15

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

DEWAN'S OFFICE.
Date of Receipt 11 8 15
Petn. Regr. No 6368

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ఎందలోచెడిపోయాండ్రు
మళ్ళిపోవడశక్యంకాదు
10వ అసెంబ్లీ 1915లో

2576

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

No 669 E. & A. dated 19/1/15

Mem 323-13-4

The accompanying Petition Registered

No. 311 dated 10.8.15

received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Vodaluga of Ramapura village in the Channapatna Taluk, praying for early orders in the matter of the cancellation of the order of the D.C. authorising, directing Vodale by public auction, the "Mudi Kanikeke" of the temple of Sree Hanumantha

X Dewan of Mysore

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~,

to the ... By Collector of Bangalore

~~to expedite the~~ for report

In Cont. No. ~~Called for in~~ this office No: 1895 Dy 27.1.16, ~~in the matter~~. Mem 323-13

By Order,

25/1

for Secretary to Government.

Rev Dept.

BANGALORE,

..... 191

P. T. O

G I B- 1,000 -8-5 15

No 670 Dt 2. 9 15

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ ..... ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

..... ಹೋಬಳಿ

..... ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

.....

ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್ಡ್ ಹುಕುಂ.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ 10.8.15 ರಲ್ಲಿ

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.

DIARY No. 1896
19/5/16
SECTION Mad
FILE NO. 322-13
SERIAL No. 5

1915-16

From

The Dy. Comr
Bangalore Dist

To

The Secy to Govt
Rev Dept.
(Mysore)

Dated Bangalore

Despatched 13/5/16

Received

General No. $ 732
No

Enclosure No 1 file.

Submits a report on the petn of Vadaluja Bhagantru Hatapa of Sri Kengal Hanumantha Raya Swami temple in the Chen: Tk praying for the cancellation of the order directing the Sale of the right of Collecting "Hundi Kanike" in the said temple

20)
$\frac{732}{126}$

D. No.
Bangalore Dis
Dated 12th May 1916

From -
K. Chandy Esqr. B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To -
V.R. Iyengaraja Ayer Esqr. M.A.
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Revenue Department -
(Mysore)

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No. 1896 Mug/322-13-2 dated 27/1/14 calling for a report on the petition of Vadalinga Bhajanthi & Hajam of Sri Kengal Hanumanthanayasamy temple in the Cheenapatna Taluq praying for the cancellation of the order directing the auction sale of the right of collecting "Mudikanike" in the said temple, I have the honor to state that the temple in question is a Mysore institution endowed with a cash grant of Rs 1-7-3 for Padithanadipanadhane.

One Era son of Hajam Nari, applied to the Amildar on the 18th Decr 09 to lease out to him the right of collecting from the devotees Mudikanike for an annual patta of Rs 5

the Amildar on receipt of a report from the Sheikdar to the effect that the right of collecting the Mudikanike was not hereditary, ordered the same to be sold by public auction. It was accordingly (Harazo 12th) sold by public auction on 28th of February 1910 to the applicant Esa for one year for Rs 5

Thereupon one Linga petitioned to the Sub Dy Offr stating that he was the Hakdar Bhajantri of the temple and that as such he had been collecting the Mudi & Ulsara Kanike therein on payment of a sum of Rs 15 in return to the temple annually for Brindavana and Nanarabi Ulsavas, & that his grandfather had paid a sum of Rs 100 for the restoration of the temple; and prayed that the lease to Esa might be cancelled. The Amildar having reported that there

(Rs 5 ; 5-0-0)
+9.V

were two ---- ---- ----

no evidence to
Statement of Linga the Sub
Dy Officer ordered the confir
-mation of the Sale in his
No. 1005 of 24th May 1910. Sub-
-sequently the Amildar in his
No. 511 dated 11th January 1911,
reported that on further enquiry
into the matter it had been
ascertained that the ancess-
-tors of the petitioner Lingavare
doing the Bhajantre duties, and
that his grandfather had once
paid a sum of Rs 100/- for the
restoration of the temple, and
that on a previous occasion
when one Manithennia had
applied for a similar leasing
of the right of collecting
Mudukanike &c, his applica
-tion was rejected on the
ground that the right was
a Hakdari or hereditary
one, and that therefore
requested for the revision of
the order confirming Sale to
Linga - But the Sub Dy Offr
with some observations
declined to revise the order -
Upon this the Amildar
again

(Liyas's Story)

made a report to the Sub Dn Officer that Liyga had orbee greatly agreed to pay a Sum of Rs 15 for Utsavas & Rs 10 for the temple funds annually and had executed a Muttahali -Ka to that effect, and that therefore the Sale might be cancelled. The Muhandiram's re -commendation was approved by the Sub Dn Offr. - Liyga not only failed to act up to his Muttahalika in Spite of a notice served on him, pleading his inability to pay the amount & gave a Statement to the effect that the right in question might be dis -posed of in any manner - With the approval of the Sub Dn Offr the "bole" was Sold by public auction on 28th Septr 1912, and one Devayya (Hamaya Pattin) stood as the highest bidder for Rs 11 - a - u per annum for five years. Vodaliya petitioned this

office, representing that his
brother's statement foregoing
this right was prejudicial
to his interest & prayed that
it might be recognised - This
petition was rejected in this
office order No. 39 dated 31/7/1913
on the ground that his brother
Linga failed to act up to the
terms of the Mutchalika -
Pis against this order that
the present appeal has been
preferred to government -

The file of vernacular
papers ending with the postal
Sub Dy Offrs yadi No. 34 dated
12th July 1914 together with the
enclosure received with the above,
is herewith submitted for reference -

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

M. Sreenivasmurthy
for Dy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt
Absent from the Station -

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 9 of 1916-17

Appellant. *Vs.* Respondent.

Vadaliga of Ramapura, Channapatna Taluk. ~~Devaiga~~ Devida

Subject.

Appeal against ~~the~~ order No 39 & 40 of 1913 of the Dy. Commissioner, Bangalore District, ~~directing~~ sanctioning the auction sale of Kundi and utsava Kanike of Sri Kenge Hanumantharaya Swami temple ~~at Kengal~~ in the Channapatna Taluk.

* * * * * order

The case was ~~finally~~ heard before Govt on 10th March 1917, Both the aplt and respdt were represented Through their Advocates.

2) The appellant claims the right to collect ~~in~~ the utsava Kanike

GPB—500—12-6-13

as a hereditary boon
But he has adduced no
evidence before the lower
courts to establish this hereditary
right. From the very nature
of these kanikes, it is highly
improbable whether such a
right was ever allowed to
exist. The fact of his being
the Bhajanthi and Hajam
of the Temple does not
necessarily entitle him to
collect these kanikes for the
Temple and pay what he
likes to the institution. He
may be paid a monthly
salary like the other servants
of the Temple for the duties
he performs. ~~in the Temple~~.
The practice prevailing in
other Temples is to lease out
such "kanikes" for fixed
periods and the same has
been rightly followed in

G.R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

this instance also. On the expiry of the present lease which is reported to run up to the end of December next, the "bob" will be put up to public auction for a period of five years. The appeal is dismissed.

Memo no 232 dt 1.8.917

Mem 322-13-6 Encl file

Copy to the Dy. Commr., Bangalore Dist., with the Vern. record received with his letter no. 732 dt 13th May 1916.

By order

27/7/17

DR 27.7.17

Joint Secy

28/7/17

W D 2584—GPB—2,000—7 4 16

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

APPEAL No. 9 *OF* 1916-17

APPELLANT	RESPONDENT.
Vodalinga of Rampura, Channapatna Taluk.	Devaiah.

SUBJECT

Appeal against order No.39 dated 4th August 1913 of the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, sanctioning the auction sale of mudi and utsava kanike realizations of Sri Kengal Hanumantharayaswami temple in the Channapatna Taluk.

O R D E R.

The case was heard before Government on 10th April 1917. Both the Appellant and Respondent were represented through their Advocates.

2. The appellant claims the right to collect mudi and utsava kanike as a hereditary "bob". But he has adduced no evidence before the lower courts to establish this hereditary right. From the very nature of these kanikes, it is highly improbable whether such a right was ever allowed to exist. The fact of his being the Bhajantri and Hajam of the temple does not necessarily entitle him to collect these kanikes for the temple and pay them to the institution. He may be paid a monthly salary like the other servants of the temple for the duties he performs. The practice prevailing in other temples is to lease out such "kanikes" for limited periods and the same has been rightly followed in this instance also. On the

expiry of the present lease which is reported to run up to the end of December next, the "bob" will be put up to public auction for a period of five years. The appeal is dismissed.

GKV.3